

Attorney Docket No.: NL 000287

IN THE DRAWINGS:

Please include the New Sheet labeled "FIG. 6," hereto attached, to the sheets of drawings of the present application.

Attorney Docket No.: NL 000287

REMARKS**I. INTRODUCTION**

Claims 1, 2, 4, 7-13, 15, and 17 have been amended. Claims 3 and 6 have been cancelled. Claim 18 has been added. Thus, claims 1-2, 4-5, and 7-18 remain pending in the present application. No new matter has been added. In view of the above amendments and following remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable.

II. THE OBJECTION TO THE SPECIFICATION SHOULD BE WITHDRAWN

The specification of the disclosure stands as objected to by the Examiner for missing headings or labels. The specification has been amended to include headings. As per MPEP § 1893.03(e), please include the abstract that appears on the cover page of the pamphlet published by the International Bureau of the World Intellectual Property Organization as the abstract for the present application.

III. THE OBJECTION TO THE DRAWINGS SHOULD BE WITHDRAWN

The drawings stand as objected to by the Examiner under 37 CFR 1.83 for not showing every feature of the invention. Fig. 6, hereto attached, has been added to show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Specifically, Fig. 6 shows the steps of the claims disclosed in the specification. Furthermore, the specification has been amended to include a brief description of the drawing. It should be noted that support for Fig. 6 is provided in the

Attorney Docket No.: NL 000287

specification. (See Specification, p. 8, l. 9 – p. 9, l. 2; and p. 9, ll. 17-20). No new matter has been added.

IV. THE 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) REJECTIONS SHOULD BE WITHDRAWN

Claims 1-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Dahlgren, et al., “Radar Signal Detection Via ARMA Modeling,” (IEEE-95). (“Dahlgren ”). (See 08/02/05 Office Action, p. 4, ¶ 4).

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, “...splitting the target spectrum in at least a first part and a second part *in response to a determination by a logarithmic regression, such that an iterative procedure is used in a frequency domain* to obtain a better split than an initial split until a stop criterion is met...” (Emphasis added).

In contrast, Dahlgren generally relates to the use of auto-regressive moving-average (“ARMA”) spectral estimation techniques. Specifically, Dahlgren describes a method for choosing an appropriate model, estimating the parameters of the model, and determining the power spectral density (“PSD”) of the model using the estimated parameter and the theoretical PSD expression. (See Dahlgren, p. 437, 1st ¶). The ARMA modeling according to Dahlgren is a time series, and is defined by a linear differential equation for the resulting output sequence. (See *Id.*). The ARMA model is broken into two parts, each having a resulting difference equation of a linear regression of terms on itself. (See *Id.*). Thus, the modeling according to Dahlgren is calculated in the time domain. Furthermore, the poles and zeros in the PSD function are determined on a linear scale. Accordingly, Dahlgren neither teaches nor suggests “...splitting the target spectrum in at least a first part and a second part *in response to a determination by a logarithmic regression, such that an iterative procedure is used in a*

Attorney Docket No.: NL 000287

frequency domain to obtain a better split than an initial split until a stop criterion is met..." as recited in claim 1.

Applicants respectfully submit that for at least the reasons stated above, claim 1 of the present application is not anticipated by Dahlgren, and request that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn. As claims 2-7 depend from, and therefore include all the limitations of claim 1, it is hereby submitted that these claims are also allowable.

Claim 8 stands rejected as anticipated by the ARMA modeling described in Dahlgren. (See 08/02/05 Office Action, p. 4, ¶ 4). Claim 8 is a device claim reciting limitations substantially similar to those of claim 1. Such limitations include "...*in response to a determination by a logarithmic regression, such that an iterative procedure is used in a frequency domain* to obtain a better split than an initial split until a stop criterion is met..." (Emphasis added). Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 8 is allowable for at least the reasons discussed above with regard to claim 1.

V. THE 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) REJECTIONS SHOULD BE WITHDRAWN

The Examiner has rejected claims 9-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Dahlgren in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,070,137 to Bloebaum et al. ("Bloebaum"). (See Office Action, p. 8, ¶ 6). Claims 9-10 recite limitations substantially similar to those of claim 1, including "...*in response to a determination by a logarithmic regression, such that an iterative procedure is used in a frequency domain* to obtain a better split than an initial split until a stop criterion is met..." (Emphasis added). As discussed above, Dahlgren does not teach or suggest the limitations of independent claims 1. It is respectfully submitted that Bloebaum does not cure the defects of Dahlgren.

Attorney Docket No.: NL 000287

The Examiner has rejected claims 11 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Dahlgren in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,167,375 to Miseki et al. ("Miseki"). (See Office Action, p. 10, ¶ 7). Claims 11 and 13 recite limitations substantially similar to those of claim 1, including "...*in response to a determination by a logarithmic regression, such that an iterative procedure is used in a frequency domain* to obtain a better split than an initial split until a stop criterion is met..." (Emphasis added). As discussed above, Dahlgren does not teach or suggest the limitations of independent claims 1. It is respectfully submitted that Miseki does not cure the defects of Dahlgren.

Accordingly, because claims 12, 14, and 16-18 depend from and, therefore, include all of the limitations of independent claim 11, it is respectfully submitted that claims 12, 14, 16-18 are allowable over the cited references for at least the same reasons stated above in regard to claim 11. Accordingly, because claim 15 depends from and, therefore, includes all of the limitations of independent claim 13, it is respectfully submitted that claim 15 is allowable over the cited references for at least the same reasons stated above in regard to claim 13.

Attorney Docket No.: NL 000287

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the now pending claims are in condition for allowance. All issues raised by the Examiner having been addressed. An early and favorable action on the merits is earnestly solicited.

Please direct all future correspondence to:

Larry Liberchuk
Senior IP Counsel

Philips Intellectual Property & Standards
P.O. Box 3001
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001
Phone: (914) 333-9602
Fax: (914) 332-0615
Email: larry.liberchuk@philips.com

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 1, 2006


By: Greg F. Kaplun (Reg. No. 48,198)